

United States Patent and Trademark Office

V

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,260	11/08/2006	Charles Mioskowski	BJS-1721-100 1828	
23117 7590 10/04/2007 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			LE, HOA T	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/553,260	MIOSKOWSKI ET AL			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	H. T. Le	1773			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication: - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
,	,—				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
:					
Attachment(s) 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Oct. 2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate			

Î

Application/Control Number: 10/553,260

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the misidentification of one figure drawing. Page 7, line 26, "Figure 3a" does not exist. Only figure 3 is found in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products*, *Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

Art Unit: 1773

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Page 3

The description of lipid compounds is not fully comprehensible because the structure as defined is ambiguous. The structure of A as portrayed in the specification appears to be NOT a lipid chain but rather just an alkyne chain. However, in the description of the group R1, it is stated that "R1 representing H or COOH radical if A represents a single lipid chain". How could A be a lipid chain in such structure? This is confusing. In addition, Z and R2 are described as "may also be hydrophilic or neutral polar heads of the sugar or polysaccharide type". What can Z and R2 could possibly be if that is the case? What constitutes a neutral polar head of the sugar or polysaccharide type? How could R2 fit in the structures as defined if it's a "polar head" of a sugar or polysaccharide (if once the meaning of such term could be ascertained). One having ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and/or use lipid compounds as described because their description appears to be incorrect or ambiguous at best.

- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 7. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Page 4

In claim 1, the lipid compounds as described in the claims appear to be either incorrect or too vague to be comprehensible. The structure of A as shown appears to be NOT a lipid chain but rather just an alkyne chain. However, it is stated that "R1 representing H or COOH radical if A represents a single lipid chain". How could A be a lipid chain in such structure? This is confusing. In addition, Z and R2 are described as "may also be hydrophilic or neutral polar heads of the sugar or polysaccharide type". What can Z and R2 could possibly be if that is the case? What constitutes a neutral polar head of the sugar or polysaccharide type? How could R2 fit in the structures as defined if it's a "polar head" of a sugar or polysaccharide (if once the meaning of such term could be ascertained). In addition, "polysaccharide type" renders the claim indefinite because it's unclear what "type" denotes or includes. Note also that the phrase that defines Z and R2 appears twice in claim 1.

Claim 1 is further indefinite because the phrase "novel structure with macromolecules self-organized around nanotube characterized in that" renders the subject matter of the claim unclear. It's not clear what is being claimed. It is suggested that "with" be replaced with "comprising" and "characterized in that" with "wherein" for clarity.

In claim 6, "polysaccharide type" renders the claim indefinite because it's unclear what "type" denotes or includes.

In claim 7, "structures" (plural) has no clear antecedent basis.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 suffer the same deficiency of claim 7.

In claim 12, "stripped nanotubes" have no clear antecedent basis. Note that only "raw nanotubes" is previously recited.

Claims 13-16 provide for the use of structures, but, since the claims does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 15 and 16 are further indefinite in that it is unclear what "molecular motors" or "vectorization" denotes.

Other claims are deemed indefinite in view of their dependency upon claim 1.

8. References are cited as art of interest.

Drawings

9. The drawings are objected to because the copy of the drawings is blurred.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency.

Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application

Art Unit: 1773

must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

<u>/H. Thi Le/</u>
H. (Holly) T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

September 30, 2007